

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 5. No. 13.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper  
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1940.

6d. Weekly.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Your trouble, Clarence, is that you don't pay sufficient attention to the Moaning at the Ba-Ba-C. If you did, you'd understand:

- (a) That Sacrifice is the Big Idea. Pie in the Sky.
- (b) That means that we must all work harder and consume less so that we can Export More. Guns instead of butter.
- (c) Then, after the war, we shall have captured Germany's trade.
- (d) With all the rebuilding the bombs are providing for us, there'll be no unemployment queues for years, just as Mr. Bevin says.
- (e) By that time we shall be working up for another and bigger war.

You say it sounds like an old gramophone record? Of course it does. It's called "Ye Banks and Crooks o' Britain's Doom." You can play it over and over until the spring breaks.

The right (not the privilege) of unfettered expression of opinion by the individual, is the foundation of civilised society, and like all genuine rights, carries with it its own penalty for misuse—the *dis-credit* of the misuser. But the functionary, as such, has no such right. He speaks with propriety only in exposition of a policy which is not, and ought not to be, his.

The flatulent eructations of Mr. Ernest Bevin on the subject of the profit motive—a technical subject on which he obviously does not know as much as would inform him that it is technical—however stupid they may be, would be entirely permissible if he made it clear that it is only earnest little Ernest saying his Socialist Sunday-School piece. But he speaks as a Cabinet Minister. Either he is voicing policy of the most vicious kind, or he is using the prestige of his office to give weight to opinions which are not worth

serious attention. In the first alternative, he ought to be called to account immediately by the House of Commons for a policy which has never been discussed and if discussed, would be rejected. And, in the second alternative, he ought to be rapped smartly over the knuckles by the Prime Minister for misuse of the prestige of his Office.

When a hen crosses the road, it does so in view of a prospective profit. A man breathes, eats, sleeps, clothes himself, and works, all for a prospective profit. His judgement as to what constitutes a genuine profit may be at fault—it often is—ably assisted to that end by advertisement and propaganda! But that has nothing whatever to do with the profit motive as such. "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" is an exhortation to sound judgement, never more needed than now, God wot, when "Leaders" are three-a-penny. It certainly is not a condemnation of the search for a genuine profit.

To anyone who has not lost the capacity to think, it is the failure (which the international banker is trying to foist on the producer by backing the Socialist) of the Monopoly of Credit to allow the general public to receive their dividend of profit, which is the root of the present situation. Socialism is consciously intended, by those forces which alone have the power to instal it, to render this temporary and remediable defect, permanent and universal, and to force the individual to sell his soul for a mess of pottage!

One of the strongest pieces of internal evidence in favour of the theory that Hitler is a Jew, is his obviously sincere belief that it is intolerable that anyone should claim any rights which he wants himself.

### JAY v. HOBSON

The curious watertight construction of the orthodox Economist's brain is well exemplified by an argument now proceeding between the City Editors of two contemporaries. Mr. Douglas Jay of the *Daily Herald* freely admits the costless creation of credit by the banks, but either overlooking or ignoring the uses to which this operation might be put he holds that an annual capital tax should be made now "to keep down war borrowings." For he points out:

"If the present war lasts for four years and the annual deficit averages £3,000,000,000 (as is likely), we shall finish the war with a national debt of £20,000,000,000, and an interest bill of perhaps £600,000,000, or two thirds of the total yield of taxation before the war.

"And surely Mr. Hobson realises that after the war threatening unemployment will necessitate continued borrowings for public works, and that there will be no question of repayment of debt by Budget surpluses, which would be acute-deflationary....

"And can he suggest any other method of avoiding these lasting evils and injustices other than that of starting the capital levy during the war?"

He inscribed this passage only a few days after giving most clear exposition of the creation of credit by the banks and an apparent understanding of its implications.

Mr. Oscar Hobson conveniently leaves himself only an inch of column for the question of costless credit, upon which he most emphatically disagrees with Mr. Jay:

"I have left myself no space to argue this question of costless credit, so must leave it for the moment with one dogmatic sentence. The creation of credit by the banks is 'costless' only in the sense that the extraction of a tooth by a dentist (merely a wrench and a

twist!) is costless to him. It is costless only if one glosses over the fact that the apparent ease with which each operation is performed is conditional upon the prior existence of a complicated and expensive organism."

—Which is costly to *somebody else* and costless to the easy performer who imposes the cost *on somebody else*.

### Mr. SIEFF IN AMERICA

Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, the vice-chairman and managing director of Marks and Spencer, is now in the United States with several experts studying the possibilities of markets there.

Messrs. Marks and Spencer have recently formed a subsidiary company to conduct export business, especially to the United States.

"The choice of the U.S. market (whence this very principle of organisation came originally to be linked up with mass distribution) may seem at first sight like carrying coals to Newcastle," says *The Times* of November 18, and it goes on to point out that there has always been "what might be termed a 'prestige' demand in the U.S. for certain articles of British manufacture, especially textiles and footwear."

Mr. Leonard Elmhirst, who is a member of P.E.P. (of which Mr. Sieff is chairman) and with whose name is associated the Dartington Hall School and 'colony,' is said to be in America with Mr. J. Schiff.

### THE NAMING OF BOMBED TOWNS

Mr. A. A. Milne, in a letter to *The Times* of December 2, wrote:—

"One of the causes of the 'British Pessimism of which you write is the feeling among civilians that the Government does not understand the

totalitarian nature of this war, a feeling strengthened by the anomalous position of the civilian himself.

"On the one hand he is told *ad nauseam* that he is no longer a civilian; that he is as fully in the fighting-line as any soldier; that his labour, courage, and endurance are as important to the national effort as are those of the fighting Services. All of which is true. Nevertheless he is still treated with the contempt considered due to a civilian in war-time. He receives a stream of exhortation, a deluge of propaganda, such as any member of the fighting Services would rightly resent; and whenever there is a clash of interests between him and his fellow-fighter in uniform, it is never doubted that it is he who must give way. For instance:—

"1. If the Army needs help from the Navy and Air Force, then, as at Dunkirk, that help is automatically forthcoming. But if the civilian asks for military assistance in the Battle of London, how grudging is the reply! Perhaps a few odd Pioneers are reluctantly detailed to help restore working conditions; but for the rest the Army says firmly that it cannot interrupt its training in order to take part in such unmilitary activities. . . . It should be obvious by now that munition and transport workers are just as much part of the Army as the Army Service Corps.

"2. Bristol is bombed. Presumably the air censor says to himself: 'The Germans came to bomb Bristol, and will claim to have bombed Bristol. But they cannot be absolutely certain that they did not bomb Bath by mistake. It is better to leave them with this slight uncertainty. We will therefore call it 'a West Country town.' Which, as far as it goes, is good sense. But it is clear that he is only thinking of it as an Air Force problem. The anxiety and unhappiness of all with relations in other West Country towns, the despair of the intelligent at such a lack of imagination: these mark no high road to Bristol for the next flight of bombers, and are therefore ignored.

"This want of co-ordination is an old complaint against Governments. Each Department thinks departmentally, leaving the co-ordination of thought to a Cabinet which is busy thinking of something else. But our modern complaint is that the fighting Services are still considered to be above co-ordination with mere civilians. . . . It is a 'military necessity' to call Bristol a West Country town, but it is a civilian necessity to

call it Bristol; it is a military necessity to get on with training, but it is a civilian necessity to make bombed roads instantly free for traffic. Which is the over-riding, national necessity—and is it anybody's duty to decide?"

### PARLIAMENT

November 20.

Written Answers (42 columns)

#### SYNTHETIC FUEL PRODUCTION.

*Mr. Craven-Ellis* asked the Secretary for Mines whether his Department has investigated the possibilities of the manufacture of synthetic fuel oils and alcohol from our large carboniferous deposits; and with what result?

*Mr. Grenfell*: During the last few months authoritative committees have been investigating on behalf of my Department, various methods for producing oil, and substitutes for oil, from coal or its derivatives. In particular, I have received a most valuable report on the Fischer-Tropsch and similar synthetic processes from a committee under the chairmanship of my right hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor-General. The other committees have also all submitted their reports, which are under consideration.

#### CURRENCY.

*Mr. Craven-Ellis* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will give the total of the money available in the form of small token coinage, currency notes, and bank money, deposits, respectively; and state why bank money, deposits, is not legal tender, and explain how this money comes into existence?

*Sir K. Wood*: Coin in circulation in the United Kingdom in September last is estimated at £88,000,000. Currency notes were withdrawn from circulation in 1928, but the active circulation of Bank of England notes on the 13th November was £594,000,000. Complete statistics of bank money, in the sense of deposits (time and demand) are not available, but the current deposit and other accounts disclosed by the returns of the clearing banks for October were £2,660,000,000. It would be impracticable to give legal tender status to cheques and other instruments by which bank deposits are transferred. Their value depends on the resources of the drawer. In reply to the last part of the question, I cannot adequately deal with so extensive a topic within the limits of a reply to a Parliamentary Question.

### BELFAST D.S.C. GROUP

Public meetings on the third Wednesday in each month. Next meeting December 18, Subject:

*Why Fear Dominates the World.*

All meetings in the Lombard Cafe, Lombard Street, at 8 p.m. Correspondence to the Hon. Sec., 17 Creagh Road, Belfast.

## EYE ON PARLIAMENT

The following passages are taken from the House of Commons Official Report (Editor, P. Cornelius), known as 'Hansard'. The date and occasion of the words are given above each section, and the speakers' names by the side. The number of columns occupied by the printed report of each section cited is also given. Lack of space imposes a severe limitation on the selection of matter for reproduction.

November, 19.

Oral Answers (33 columns)

### DETENTIONS.

*Mr. Stokes* asked the Home Secretary whether the recommendations of the Advisory Committee are made known to any person detained under Section 18B as soon as received from the advisory committee; and whether, in the case of continued detention, the person concerned is allowed to know the reason for that decision?

*Mr. Peake*: Every person is informed of my right hon. Friend's decision as soon as it has been reached. The report of the Advisory Committee is a confidential report for the information of the Home Secretary. It is not communicated to the person who is detained. A copy of the Home Secretary's order for detention is given to the person concerned at the time of his arrest and he subsequently receives from the Chairman of the Committee sufficient particulars of the case against him to leave him under no misapprehension as to the reasons for his detention. It will be appreciated that persons detained under Defence Regulation 18B are not charged with specific offences against the law. Where there is evidence of such offences, proceedings are instituted in the courts.

*Mr. Stokes*: Are we to understand that these persons are not told the reasons for their continued detention? Does the hon. Gentleman consider it in accordance with British justice that they should be detained indefinitely without having their case heard in open court?

*Mr. Peake*: Where continued detention is ordered by the Home Secretary, it is perfectly clear that the reasons for the continued detention are the same as the reasons for the original detention.

*Mr. Stokes*: In view of the fact that these people have appealed and have had their case heard and are not told the reason, does the hon. Gentleman still think it fair to continue to have them detained without giving them specific reasons why the detention is recommended?

*Mr. Peake*: The report of the Com-

mittee is of an advisory character, and it is the Home Secretary's decision which is final. The reasons for the detention are given to the detainee before the hearing of his case by the Committee, and, if continued detention is ordered, it is clear that the reasons are the same as those for the original order.

*Mr. Stokes*: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that some of the reasons for which they have been detained are utterly frivolous?

*Mr. Speaker rose—*

*Mr. Stokes*: I beg to give notice that I will raise the matter on the Adjournment.

### NATIONAL FINANCE.

#### TREASURY DEPOSIT RECEIPTS.

*Mr. De la Bère* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether, in connection with the issue of Treasury deposit receipts, he will reduce the rate of interest payable to the banks from now onwards?

*Sir K. Wood*: I would refer my hon. Friend to the answer which I gave him on this subject on 7th November.

*Mr. De la Bère*: Will my right hon. Friend bear in mind when the opportunity of funding these Treasury receipts occurs, that the interest has been unduly generous throughout the whole time they have been running?

*Mr. De la Bère* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider fixing a limit of £500,000,000 to the amount of Treasury deposit receipts that are permitted to be outstanding at any one time from now onwards?

*Sir K. Wood*: No, Sir.

*Mr. De la Bère*: Are we to understand that these amounts are to be funded in the near future?

*Sir K. Wood*: I could not possibly say in advance how far we may wish to borrow direct from the banks, as distinct from borrowing by Treasury Bills, or by Ways and Means advances.

*Mr. Shinwell*: If the right hon. Gentleman does not propose to place a limit on the amount of Treasury deposits

and will not agree to any reduction on the interest, is he not piling up the burden for the community after the war?

*Sir K. Wood*: I think that on the whole it is a reasonable arrangement in the interest of the community.

*Mr. De la Bère*: When will the Treasury display a gleam of vision?

### BANK RATE.

*Mr. Craven-Ellis* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the purpose of the present relatively high Bank Rate is to discourage commercial banks and the money market from going to the Bank of England for Treasury bill re-discounting facilities; has he considered the effect on the Treasury bill rate if the Bank Rate were fixed at 1 per cent.; and what are the advantages of the present high Bank Rate, which could be reduced at the discretion of the Treasury?

*Sir K. Wood*: I do not agree that the present Bank Rate is high. As I informed my hon. Friend on 18th June, decisions about the level of Bank Rate involve a number of different factors, apart from its effect on the Treasury bill rate, which can hardly be discussed within the limits of an answer to a Parliamentary Question. I would, however, refer my hon. Friend to the statement on the subject which was made during the Debate on the Second Reading of the Finance (No. 2) Bill on 6th August by my right hon. and gallant Friend the Financial Secretary to the Treasury.

*Mr. Craven-Ellis*: Does not the right hon. Gentleman consider that the Bank Rate is unreasonably high? Can I have a reply to the last part of the Question as to what are the advances of the present high rate?

*Sir K. Wood*: I do not accept my hon. Friend's suggestion. I would, however, like him to look at the statement given by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, which dealt with this point at considerable length.

*Mr. Craven-Ellis*: I know the statement to which the hon. Gentleman

refers, but I must ask him to let me—

*Mr. Speaker rose—*

November 20.

Oral Answers (33 columns).

TREASURY STAFF.

*Mr. De la Bère* asked the Prime Minister whether he will consider the creation of two new appointments at the Treasury, or, alternatively, seconding some few selected members from other Departments for the purpose of developing and infusing modern thought and modern methods into the Treasury practice, having regard to the need of efficiency and modern methods for the successful prosecution of the war?

*The Lord Privy Seal (Mr. Attlee)*: I cannot accept the implication contained in my hon. Friend's Question. I may say, however, that the Treasury, in common with many other Departments, has added to its staff a considerable number of persons with varied outside experience to assist in dealing with problems arising from war; it is also the normal practice to arrange interchanges of staff between the Treasury and other Departments. Hon. Members will recollect, moreover, that my hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer recently asked Lord Catto to become Financial Adviser to the Treasury and invited a number of distinguished persons to form a Consultative Council; several of the members of this body are now giving a large part of their time to Treasury problems.

*Mr. De la Bère*: Will the right hon. Gentleman direct the attention of the Treasury to the need for modern and constructive thought in connection with the funding of Treasury deposit receipts? Is there not a danger that these funding operations may benefit the banks at the expense of the taxpayers throughout the country, and that these interests will be completely subordinated?

*Mr. Attlee*: No doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer will note my hon. Friend's comments.

*Mr. Shinwell*: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, if modern thought has been infused into Treasury practice in recent times, it is not disclosed in the answers of the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

*Mr. Bevan*: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is widespread apprehension that the monetary situation is getting out of hand and that

inflation is proceeding rapidly, and ought not something to be done about it?

PAMPHLETS OVER GERMANY.

*Mr. Stokes* asked the Minister of Information whether he will arrange for the publication in English of pamphlets distributed over or sent to Germany since 1st June, 1940?

*Mr. Butler*: I have been asked to reply. The answer is in the negative.

*Mr. Stokes*: Will the right hon. Gentleman reconsider his decision, and will he at any rate consider giving some indication to Members of Parliament as to what procedure they should follow in order to satisfy themselves that the right stuff is being sent over to Germany?

*Mr. Butler*: I quite understand the interest of hon. Members in this subject, and I will certainly see that the point put by the hon. Member has consideration.

*Sir H. Williams*: Is the object to conceal from the Germans what is said in the leaflets that are being sent to them?

*Mr. Garro Jones*: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that certain Germans have been able to obtain copies of these leaflets and have printed them, and will he see that there is a consistent policy of either securing their publication or preventing it?

*Mr. Butler*: I think that was some time ago.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

*Commander Bower (Cleveland)*: I beg permission to make a personal statement in order to correct and clarify certain statements made by me in the speech on the Adjournment on 7th November, when my hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (*Mr. Stokes*) raised the question of the evacuation of Narvik and the loss of H.M.S. "Glorious." At that time the chief burden of my criticism of the Admiralty and the conduct of those operations was that certain high commands and staffs, notably that of the R.A.F. Coastal Command, whose close co-operation was essential for the success of the operation, were not informed. I also stated that the Director of Operations at the Admiralty was not fully informed. I have now received a letter from Captain Harcourt, the Director of Operations at the Admiralty, in which he

corroborates my main criticism by saying:

"The facts were that it was necessary to observe the utmost secrecy in this operation, as is the case in all operations requiring a military withdrawal, and the Chiefs of Staffs gave instructions that this operation was only to be made known to those who were actually concerned in the carrying of it out. For this reason Coastal Command were not informed, as you very rightly state."

He also says:

"I as Director of Operations was fully informed of the operation comprising the evacuation of Narvik, and the other officers of my division who had to deal with this particular operation were similarly informed."

I myself derived the impression that this officer was not fully informed from a telephone conversation with him at the time, but I wish to say that I fully, absolutely and unreservedly accept his version of the incident, and I therefore beg leave to withdraw the statement that he was not fully informed. In doing so I think I ought to pay a tribute to the high sense of duty shown by this officer who, in the interest of fairness and accuracy, has asked me publicly to associate his name with this very unfortunately-conducted affair. In this connection it is only fair to point out that the decision not to inform the R.A.F. Coastal Command and other Commands was a Chiefs-of-Staff decision, and, therefore, no blame can be laid at Captain Harcourt's door.

*Mr. Speaker*: The hon. and gallant Member must not make comments. He rose to correct an error.

*Commander Bower*: It was only with a desire to clear the name of this officer from any suspicion of blame in the matter. Secondly, Captain Harcourt and his deputy, Captain Edwards, feel that certain words of mine in which I said that I had been approached by officers holding responsible positions in the Operations Division at the Admiralty were and could be, in view of the context, applied to them. My words in this connection were most carefully drafted in order to avoid any such implications, and having re-read them I do not think that construction could fairly be put upon them; but at the same time I do want to make it clear that my contact with these officers was of a purely service character. I am only slightly acquainted with them and their conduct in this matter was always most formal and of the orthodox character, and in no way was either of those two officers implicated.

# THE DECLINE OF FEAR

By B. M. PALMER

A correspondent has accused me of being a "warmonger." I consulted the dictionary and found that a warmonger was one who deals or trades in war. I must say that it is most unlikely I shall make any pecuniary advantage out of the present situation, but if my correspondent means that I don't believe in peace at any price, and that I hold that some things are well worth fighting for, then I accept his appellation with pleasure. Never in my whole life have I felt so insecure as now, menaced by Nazi Socialism abroad, and P.E.P. Socialism at home; but because I know that the only chance we have against these two enemies is somehow to obtain through Parliament, complete control of naval, military and air-force sanctions, I nerve myself to live, and even find some sort of happiness, in hell.

And after all, what is peace? It is not just an absence of hostilities. There can be no peace anywhere until there is peace in our hearts, and this can only come through proper possession, understanding and exercise of personal sovereignty.

What kind of warmonger am I? It would give me great pleasure to chase Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin about Europe until I had bombed them. I have, in fact, a very nice little list, and they'd none of them be missed. If only the punishment could be made to fit the crime! Certain people in this country should sleep in an Anderson shelter with six inches of water in it, or on a tube platform four feet from the edge. They should spend their weekends on a mine sweeper in freezing gales. Among their "sacrifices" should be whiskey and cigars.

Yes, I have decided to be a warmonger for the duration, and this will probably give me enough to do for the rest of my life.

The first thing to hope for is a rising generation of Toughs. This, I feel sure, will horrify my correspondent. He condemns as "pernicious nonsense" my pleasure that most children are not afraid of the sirens, and take delight in collecting shrapnel. What is the use of being shocked when it is true, as he must surely see for himself? One of the outstanding points of this war is the ease with which people have become habituated to new and dangerous conditions. Nothing less makes survival

possible.

It is rather difficult to discover what the pacifists really wanted. I think they wanted everyone to be so terrified that war simply couldn't happen. How easy that would have been for the dictators and the financiers! All they would have to do would be to ride around with a few tanks and poison gas bombs, and we should all have been cowering in our cellars. That, of course, is the pet idea of the League of Nations and Federal Unionists—an international police force of bombing aeroplanes putting the fear of the Devil into us all. Pacifists play right into the hands of these people—they will do anything except fight—even pay their taxes.

And what are taxes used for?

In 1936 Major Douglas wrote in *The Fig Tree*:

"I do not myself, see any method of keeping out of the next war except by creating the maximum strength of which we are capable for military purposes, so that acts of aggression may obviously be accompanied by the most appalling consequences to the aggressor. I am perfectly conscious of all the arguments which can be adduced against such a course; some of them are quite sound, and, in particular that which insists that such a policy must be accompanied by the fostering of a tyranny which plays straight into the hands of dictators . . . nevertheless, the disarmament type of pacifist seems to me to be a little weak in the head, though doubtless, thoroughly sound in the heart. If he had done what, I may be allowed to say, I have done, and with me probably most of the readers of this Review, if he had pointed out, almost before the last war was over, that another and greater war was inevitable if international finance remained unchecked, I think that his pacifism would have been far more effective. Had he responded to the challenge, that he should refuse to pay taxes to an armed government, he would, at any rate, have given evidence of sincerity."

That was the position in 1936. It was the socialist and communist element in our midst, backed up by woolly-minded pacifists who prevented our efficient rearmament. Things were done in a half-hearted way. By some mirac-

ulous foresight or chance, the re-organisation of the airforce had been entrusted to Lord Trenchard. Had that not been done and had Chamberlain not gone to Munich, we should now be in the condition of Poland. We are not in so desperate a straight as might well have been. We are now fighting for our lives. Russian Communism, organised behind the scenes by Jewish financiers, will support anything that divides or weakens a country which they have marked down for a victim. Hence the communist support for pacifism. It cannot be denied. Over and over again I have known the two to go hand in hand—especially among school teachers.

This is the conflict of Kilkenny cats planned by the financiers and all we can do is to fight more effectively and hope we are slightly stronger than the other cat.

So when her mother tells me that Margaret is growing up a tough, I have a thrill of pleasurable anticipation. Physical courage is on the increase but what we must also have is a people who will act on their own convictions.

And that is my main case against the Pacifists. They had opinions, but would not endorse them with action: they tried to remove the symptoms of war without removing the cause.

Mere opinions, unless consistently followed are a cause of inaction, of inhibition. An opinion acted upon *very* soon becomes a conviction—a flaming sword drawn against him who can kill the soul.

For why fear war, and accept wage slavery? Why tremble at a bomb, and permit miners to die unnecessarily? Why refuse to join the army, but stand in the queue of the unemployed outside the labour exchange? Why hate the armed forces, but support the regimentation of the "right to work?"

Why condemn aggression, and yet support an economic system which states that exports must be larger than imports? Do not all these things kill the soul?

There is only one death to fear. But I do not believe that all our countrymen are going through this war with dead souls. I think they have not yet been born.

November 27, 1940.



## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

### SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Home and abroad, post free: One year 30/-; Six months 15/-;  
Three months 7s. 6d..

#### Editorial Office:

4, ACREFIELD ROAD,  
WOOLTON, LIVERPOOL.  
Telephone: Gateacre 1561.

#### Business Office:

12, LORD STREET,  
LIVERPOOL, 2.  
Telephone: Bank 5260.

Vol. 5. No. 13.

Saturday, December 7, 1940.

## 'SCOOPING THE WORLD'

The London correspondent of the *Toronto Evening Telegram* voices the protest of the London correspondents of newspapers throughout the British Empire in a long letter to *The Daily Telegraph* on the subject of a New York journalist's attempt to "scoop the world" in the matter of the London 'Blitz.'

The American journalist's name is Ingersoll, a name we have formerly associated with mass-produced watches and a massive tome of 'American' philosophy of anarchic-profound tendency. The gentleman's other name is Ralph. Mr. Ingersoll, it seems, has started one of those super-papers of which some astonishing examples are known over here. While sober, well-intentioned journals like *The Social Crediter* are struggling with the book-sellers' ramp and the wholesale distributors' ramp to attain a circulation which a 'County' newspaper office would deem small, these journals accelerate against gravity as though propelled by the blast from one of Mr. Hitler's largest and latest. 'Money' in the rather loose sense in which that term is used by the man in the street, seems to be literally 'no object' (pure subject, perhaps) and in the twinkling of an eye the thing clouds the sun, stares up at us from the gutters, litters the barbers' shops, obscures our view of our neighbours' faces in all the trains still running, bulges from the pockets of the most unlikely people—it's all over the place.

The 'working journalist' (by which technical term is meant the man trained to write for the Press, who knows how to write for the Press and is dependent for his living on writing for the Press) gives each new journal of this kind a glance in which hope and apprehension

are unequally mingled and then 'falls for it' like the rest of the public. Established journalists are not prone to jealousy when such new stars hurtle into the firmament. Such spectacles certainly do not dismay them.

Nevertheless Mr. Ralph Ingersoll's exploit has occasioned dismay in a large and influential body of journalists who met in London specially to consider it and expressed the 'unanimous view' and expressed it 'with some warmth,' "that Mr. Ingersoll's picture of the effects of the Blitzkrieg is exaggerated, and its publication throughout America and Canada and in this country a grave disservice."

Mr. W. T. Cranfield, the Toronto journalist who voices this opinion, may, and his colleagues may, attach more importance to the objective particulars of exaggeration on Mr. Ingersoll's part than to the 'disservice' associated with his meteoric rise to public notice in England. If they do, they are misplacing their emphasis. Matters of mere description, particularly in journalistic circles, are very largely subjective. 'Reporting' depends chiefly upon the frame of mind in which the 'reporter' goes out of his employers' office to collect his 'report,' and that frame of mind may have taken years or months or seconds to produce. It isn't HIS frame of mind.

And so we say that whether Mr. Ingersoll's London which Hitler 'won' last September but didn't take or whether less American correspondents' pictures of the London still secure after eleven weeks of bombing is the truer is entirely beside the point. The divergence is one of policy.

It is on that account that an

allegation made by Mr. Cranfield on behalf of the London correspondents of British Imperial newspapers assumes importance. This allegation is that the American visitor whose purple patches are objected to should have been accorded facilities which are consistently denied to them. 'Consistently' is Mr. Cranfield's word, and so is 'denied.' "He was," says Mr. Cranfield, "granted an individual interview with the Prime Minister, was freely received by high service officials and given access to secret official records."

Mr. Cranfield concludes his letter:

"No Empire journalist resident here has enjoyed any of these advantages, though the goodwill of the Press of the self-governing Dominions is as important to Britain as that of any country in the world. The majority have never spoken with the Premier in their lives. They have been instructed by their editors to seek his views on this and that, but none has ever had access to him.

"Now that those responsible for the bestowal of these invidious favours see the unfortunate misuse that can be made of them perhaps more confidence will be extended to those—and here I speak for my colleagues, not for myself—whose honest and often brilliant work has rarely had proper recognition though they have nursed no high-flown ambition to 'scoop the world.'"

But how did it occur that a course of behaviour offensive to the whole body of Empire correspondents should receive accessory endorsement from the heart of the Empire in whose interest they claim (and properly in the present case) to conduct their trade? Does irresponsibility outrun its servants?

T. J.

## BANANAS TO BE BANNED

There will be no bananas obtainable after the end of the year.

All licences for the importation of bananas have been stopped by the Government as from November 26.

About 75 per cent. of the bananas imported to this country—22,000,000 a week—come from Jamaica, and most of the remainder also come from sources from which Britain can purchase without loss of foreign exchange.

## DESPOTISMS THREE AND FOUR

By John Mitchell

One of the characteristics of the Jew is that he will not tolerate competition, and consequently he is always working for a Monopoly. His *modus operandi* is distinctive and unique, it stops at nothing and it works along many paths simultaneously. If a competitor cannot be defeated by the normal methods of competition, then the Jew will work to enter the competitor's business and get control of it.

One can clearly recognise in the world wide scheming for a World Government, the manifestations of which crop up here, there and everywhere, the characteristics which distinguish the Jew. There is the plan for a World Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which has the sanctions (national and international) of Soviet Russia behind it. The specific *modus operandi* of this plan was summed up by Stalin in a speech in 1939 when he said:

"The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work . . . . and to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course 'in the interests of peace,' and to dictate the conditions to the enfeebled belligerents."

Then there is the plan for World Government which has the sanctions of Nazi Germany behind it. This plan, which the Internationalists have been working on, was probably the most hopeful, from their point of view. But, in all probability, it has already failed. Its *modus operandi* is conquest by military might.

Thirdly we come to what might be called the American Plan. It is known that collaboration between the British and the French was of such a close nature as to make an offer of union feasible, and that such an offer was made at the psychological moment. An unexpected government was in power, and it was refused. Had it been accepted there would have been a federal union. It was known that Canadian and American papers were, about that time, discussing the matter of receiving the British Government on Canadian soil, and that the American press believed that it was likely that England would be occupied by the Germans. It is known also that President Roosevelt extracted from Mr. Churchill, in exchange for the fifty destroyers, a promise that the British Navy would not be sunk or surrendered to the Germans.

There appears, therefore, to have been an American conception that all the Governments of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the French Empire, should, presumably as some sort of federation fighting the war from the various non-European countries composing it.

So that whichever side won there would be a single Central Government possessed of the sanctions to impose its will upon all nations, although doubtless if the Nazis won, the International Government would be in an immediate position to be more ruthless and open in its rule.

But this plan has failed. And now we are witnessing an endeavour to put a fourth plan into operation. The

centre of gravity of this plan is what until a month or two ago the B.B.C called the British Empire when announcing that the National Anthem was about to be played, but which it has since taken to calling the British Commonwealth of Nations. It is based upon the belief that the British Empire will win the war and consequently its prestige will be as high, if not higher, in "World Opinion," as that of the U.S.A.

For some time now large advertisements have been appearing in the national press boosting the British Commonwealth. One of the earlier of these advertisements said:

"By 1931 this new plan of national independence, combined with loyalty freely given to the family of nations, was an accomplished fact—a political reality. The Statute of Westminster, which gave it legal shape, ranks with *Magna Carta* as one of the greatest documents of the human race.

"Why do we call this Statute of Westminster the 'new *Magna Carta*?' For this reason. The charter signed by King John in 1215 preserved the State of England by safeguarding the rights of *individual citizens*: the Statute of Westminster preserved the British Commonwealth by guaranteeing the liberties of *member nations*.

"... The British Commonwealth of Nations has the honour to hold in its hands the future of the world."

Another of these advertisements said:

"We are the *Builders* at grips with the *Destroyers*. We stand for healthy unhampered growth, fighting the disease of tyranny that stunts and kills." (Note the italicised words, which are common to Masonic Ritual.)

When the war is over, the British Commonwealth will stand, as a living example for the builders of a new and better order among the nations of the world.

Lately a new journal has been pushed to the fore. It is being advertised in the Press. It is called *Free Europe* and it declares itself to be a "fortnightly review of International affairs." Its editor is Casimir Smogorzewski and its contributors number representatives of twenty two countries. Among the British contributors have been C. R. Attlee, A. Duff Cooper, Viscount Cranbourne, Hugh Dalton, J. L. Garvin, Viscount Halifax and Sir Archibald Sinclair. It started publication in November, 1939. In a general statement on its back page it declares:

"We believe that in the new Europe which will emerge after the defeat of totalitarianism some kind of regional federation must find its place."

*Free Europe* is busy propagandising and cultivating the ground for the new plan for a World Government. It is making capital out of the British Commonwealth.

Now, *Magna Carta* and the Statute of Westminster put a check on centralised government and decentralised sovereignty to some extent. This movement has been painfully slow, but it is a movement in the right direction, in so far as it has tended to give individuals more control over their institutions. But this new plan for a

World Government, for which *Free Europe* is one propaganda organ, is endeavouring to use the prestige of the British Commonwealth to move us in the opposite direction; to graft other nations on to our Commonwealth and to use this as an excuse, not to increase the sovereignty of its members, but to decrease their sovereignty. Let us quote from some of the articles in its Anniversary Number.

Henry Wickham Steed, in an article entitled *On The Morrow of Victory*, says:

"I am among those who think the practice and the method of freedom, as they have evolved in Great Britain and in the British Commonwealth, the highest form of political association that has yet proved its abiding worth. But I am also among those who realise that this practice and this method have been evolved, in great part, under conditions of insular security from foreign attack such as few if any other European nations have enjoyed. Therefore I am not sure that British methods can serve as a model for peoples with different traditions and antecedents. Nor am I sure that even Great Britain or the members of the British Commonwealth will in future be able to enjoy the unlimited national sovereignty to which they have clung in the past."

"If civilisation is to survive, I am sure that some merging of national sovereignties will be indispensable to put an end to the method of violence in international affairs; and that, to this end, a far greater degree of co-ordination, with a total renunciation of neutrality, will be needed among the nations that are determined to remain free."

"... It is an ideal which must apply to the future international community as fully as it has come to apply to the British people and to the British Commonwealth. And I cannot define this ideal more aptly than it was defined on October 28, by *The Times* newspaper as the doctrine of freedom which emerged from long political struggles in this country:

"It is a doctrine that the interest of the Commonwealth is greater than that of any part or class, and yet that no part may be neglected in the computation of the whole; that no man is too great to be subject to the law, and none too small to enjoy its protection; that all opinions are entitled to a hearing, but none may be imposed upon the unwilling; that authority is the only safeguard of freedom, and the liberties of the subject the only abiding foundation on which authority can rest."

Dr. G. P. Gooch in an article entitled *Germany In The Europe of Tomorrow* says:

"The victors will be wise to make some sacrifices of their sovereignty. While a League of Nations will still be needed to deal with the main economic and administrative problems affecting the world as a whole, the vital issue of defence against aggression must be approached along the line of collective security through limited armaments and regional pacts. The federation of the world is far away, and even the more limited scheme of Clarence Streit is too ambitious...."

J. A. Spender entitles his article *The Shadow of Things To Come*.

He says:

"Any association of nations or system of collective security must have behind it a permanently organised power corresponding to the duties laid on it.....Our problem is to combine what is instinctive and desirable in national

patriotism and the desire for self-determination with the organised joint action that is imperative for security.

"Here, it seems to me, the way is shown by the pooling arrangements for the joint use of naval, military and air bases, arrived at by Great Britain and the United States of America. The ninety-nine years lease which gives the United States the use of these bases but leaves intact British sovereignty over these regions and the status as British citizens of those who dwell in them is a precedent which is of wide application. It is premature to say exactly how it will be developed, but the object aimed at is that the principal sea-powers shall be prepared to act together and have the use of each other's points of vantage and territorial waters and that the land powers shall similarly be prepared for joint action and lend their territories for this purpose in accordance with a concerted scheme.

"It is too soon to say what the overriding control of this organisation of power shall be."

The Polish Foreign Minister discusses the alternative methods of organising a World Government.\* His article is entitled *The Dawn of a Third System*, and he says:

"No matter how we classify the Soviet system, the fact remains that its principal aim is a world state-economic organisation to be achieved by incorporating in the Soviet Union more and more republics ready to accept the political and economic system which we have defined as 'pseudo-Communism'...."

"The Nazi system is based on a whole series of *a priori* postulates which even their originators can hardly believe, if they have any claims to intelligence. The fundamental postulate is that of the superiority of the German race over all the other races of the world...."

"Hitlerism has come up against the resistance of nations who are not prepared to admit their inferiority and prefer to risk an unequal struggle rather than submit to slavery under the new 'chosen people.' Equally, these nations are not prepared to recognise a system of European government based on the Nazi doctrine which logically leads to the hegemony of one nation and the consequent subjugation of all others to the 'race of masters'...."

"One of the faults of the Versailles system was that the League of Nations subordinated the economic to the political factor. This error must not be repeated. Indeed, it will be necessary to begin by creating an organisation based

\*Note that the *object* of all the systems, "Communist," "Nazi," "American" and "British" is a World Government.

## BOMB HITLER AND SHORTEN THE WAR!

By C. H. DOUGLAS

This leaflet is rousing great interest, particularly in districts that have suffered under heavy bombing.

Prices: 1/3 for 100; 5/- for 500; 9/- for 1,000.

Obtainable from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.



on economic realities. On such a basis political associations will inevitably develop as a logical consequence."

It is to be noted that, unlike the three other plans for a World Government, the propagandists for the new plan are not too sanguine about the feasibility of centralising sufficient political and military sanctions in the new International Government to enable it to make its rule effective. Emphasis is therefore laid upon economic organisation as a preliminary to political organisation.

The Internationalists appear to be uneasy about post war economic problems. Various excuses for international action are already being prepared. But this problem of preventing the people of the world from gaining unrestricted access to the immense flow of consumable products which the modern industrial machine is capable of producing, the potential productive capacity of which will be greatly enhanced by the discoveries and devices forced into practice by the pressure of war demands, is far more difficult than it was after the last war.

There is a general awareness in Great Britain and the Dominions that money need no longer be a hindrance to getting things done. The fact of creation of credit by the banks is even beginning to be admitted and discussed in the national Press, because in face of the growing knowledge, silence has become no longer possible.

*The Times* of November 27, had a leader entitled *Seeking a New Approach*, which clearly conveyed between the lines their difficulty in dealing with the post war economic problems in a way which would enable the would-be World Rulers to regiment the people and keep them from enjoying a degree of individual freedom in security far in excess of anything yet generally experienced, but which modern science has rendered possible. *The Times* leader discusses an article by Dr. J. W. Beyen, a former President of the Bank for International Settlements in *La France Libre*. Dr. Beyen, said *The Times*,

"foresees, however, that trouble will arise after the

destruction caused by the war has been made good, since our modern economic system, wonderfully efficient in meeting a demand for commodities, is completely at sea when it has to deal with a surplus, even a relative surplus, of production or productive capacity.

"... He regards as sterile the controversy between those who hold that we can do nothing because we shall have no money and those who maintain that money doesn't matter. It is, he says, production that is essential. The financial problem is secondary and technical. But it is a problem none the less, and a very difficult one. He accepts the view that in post-war conditions, so far as we can foresee them, the responsibility for reconstruction must be assumed by the State:—

"These and other suggestions which he makes in the course of his article are useful contributions towards the new approach, or, as he calls it, the new ideology, which is needed for the new task."

What can the British people do to destroy this new plot which is being hatched to deprive them of their freedom? The short answer is that they can insist that the economic system which is "wonderfully efficient in meeting a demand for commodities" should provide them with all the commodities it can produce that they want. This means that the banking system, which is being made to expand the Government's purchasing power during this war, must after the war be made to expand the purchasing power of the public over and above what they receive in wages and salaries. This will result in the abolition of poverty and the fight for foreign markets, which are the basic cause of war. A League of Nations or any form of International Peace Organisation will then become quite unnecessary.

The British people need to be wary of those who pat them on the back for belonging to the British Commonwealth, lest they find it enlarged to a World Commonwealth "safeguarding their liberties," from which they will not be allowed to contract out.

## SUBSTITUTE FOR WAR

One of the peculiarities of this age, and one which like most other less welcome ones, is accentuated in a nation at war, is its devotion to 'substitutes.' Significantly, it is usually the agreeable things that are substituted by less agreeable ones: eggs are still preferred to egg-substitute, most women still prefer 'real' to 'artificial' silk and will probably like rayon better than the new material to be derived from seaweed.

Substitutes for some unpleasant things are proffered, however, and notable among these are the plans, schemes and blue-prints put forward as substitutes for war itself. The innocent public is drenched with them: Commonwealths, Federal Unions, New Orders, New Europes, New Soviets. *Ersatz* unpleasantness is obviously more acceptable to most people than *ersatz* pleasure, on the chance that it may prove less painful than the original. So, as the schemes are given wide publicity, it would be unnatural if the man (or woman)-in-the-Anderson, determined not only to win the present war but also that it shall be the last, were not dazed by the appearance of such a plausible substitute before his commonsense reasserted that there was no Natural Law that made inevitable either War or its substitute, War-

by-other-means—planned and uncomfortable peace. Why War? Why War-substitute? Why not elimination of the conditions that make both War and War-substitute inevitable? If the causes of war were removed, so also would be the 'necessity' for war-substitutes.

One of the most reputable of the institutions canvassing a war-substitute is the New Commonwealth Society and Institute. Mr. Winston Churchill is the President of the British Section of this Society.

With the observation: "Clearly it is impossible to stabilise the *status quo* or to attempt to abolish war without providing an effective substitute for it in a peaceful procedure for the adjustment of grievances and the redress of injustice," the Society proceeds to enlarge on its objectives. These are:

"(1) The establishment of an International Tribunal empowered to deal with all disputes threatening the peace of the world.

"(2) The creation of an International Police Force under the control of an international authority, as a sanction of international law, and a guarantee of security against

aggression.

"The underlying principle of The New Commonwealth is that peace must be founded on Justice, and that the 'peace of righteousness' invoked by Theodore Roosevelt can only be consummated when force is placed at the service of Justice.

"The concept of Justice is the foundation of every civilised community. It is the basis of law and order. It is the bedrock of security. In all human societies experience has proved that in order to obtain Justice three institutions are necessary—a tribunal to translate Justice into terms of law, a court to interpret it, and a sanction to enforce it. The second of these institutions already exists as the Parliament Court of International Justice. We are, therefore, concerned with the creation of a Tribunal and a Police Force."

It is probable that more tyranny has been imposed in the name of 'Justice' than under any other pretext. 'Justice' has been turned from its original meaning (*jus*, right) by association with the idea of *levelling*. As an abstract the word has little meaning; but in the uncountable actions from experience of which its prestige has been abstracted (the majority of which are outside the annals of law-givers) it has a profound significance. Since it is a quality that depends primarily on the *satisfaction* of all the individuals concerned in any project, its presence is dependent on the degree of satisfaction (economic and otherwise) afforded by the state to the individuals composing it, that is, on the 'efficiency' of the state. This satisfaction, which may have different components for each person, only the individual himself can assess. The use of Tribunals, Courts and Sanction, a Code and an Abstract Principle, far from being the foundation of justice, are to a very large extent merely the measure of its deficiency. Once the state serves the individual to his satisfaction there will be no need to worry about 'Justice.'

At the time of its formation in 1938 the New Commonwealth Society was concerned with efforts to modify the League of Nations and make it the vehicle of these reforms. In its own words:

"It sought to bring about the transformation of the League into an effective international authority by means of these institutions as the first attainable step in the direction of world federation."

Now that war has supervened, its policy has been transferred to the future. It envisages a United States of Europe:

"The Society urges that:—

"(i) The consent of as many European States as possible be sought to the creation of an advisory tribunal by which equitable adjustments of territory and jurisdiction can be made between them, on the understanding that this would be followed by:—

"(ii) The establishment among them of a constitution governing their relations and providing for the common rights of their nationals throughout the area of their association:

"(iii) On this legal basis the associated States would found the following institutions: (a) a representative assembly with legislative functions within the terms of the constitution; the Assembly would be empowered to create an Equity Tribunal to assist it in the settlement of disputes:

(b) a judiciary to interpret the constitution and to adjudicate on litigation concerning it; (c) such executive ministries as are required to administer the transferred functions;

"(iv) Among these must be the maintenance and control of a common defensive force, with the exclusive use of certain categories of weapons, to protect the associated States against external aggression and to uphold the constitutional law;

(v) This implies a central control of external relations. It is not suggested that a greater share of governmental activities should be centralised than is necessary to carry out the objects stated above....

"The formation of such a European authority does not, in our view, postulate an identity of political opinion or any exclusive ideological foundation...."

The following comment in the October issue of the journal published by the society, *The New Commonwealth*, shows the practical application of these ideas:

"But,—thanks to the bold wisdom of Mr. Churchill—the project of Anglo-French union is now on the *tapis*: it is no mere hobby-horse of some tidy-minded intellectual."

Now it is clear from observation of the huge Federations that exist, that whatever these methods would do, they would not bring to the individual a satisfactory and contented peace. They bring him an irksome life of restriction and bureaucracy, a condition that is as near war as can be without the brandishing of arms, and in many ways more unbearably cruel. If these methods are a 'substitute' for war they do not escape the characteristics of substitutes, which do not always oust the natural product, while at least they bring results to the user that are nearly indistinguishable from the original—in this case disagreeable results.

What would certainly be accomplished by these measures is a transfer of power away from the individual so that he is even less able to get what he wants out of living than at present, and centralisation of that power into the hands of relatively few persons peculiarly shielded from the responsibilities consequent on its use.

The New Commonwealth is organised in two sections, the International Section and the National Section.

The International Section has a president and 14 distinguished (international) internationalists as vice-presidents. The National Section has a President (Mr. Winston Churchill) and no less than 130 distinguished (national) internationalists as vice-presidents. These include Mr. A. V. Alexander, Mr. C. R. Attlee, Mr. A. Duff Cooper, Lieut.-Colonel J. T. C. Moore-Brabazon, and Sir Archibald Sinclair, who are members of the Cabinet, as well as many other Members of Parliament. Other vice-presidents are Sir Montague Burton and Sir Julien Cahn, who have shown financial interest in the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Sir Robert Waley Cohen, the Managing director of Shell Transport Company and the Chairman of many petrol companies; the Very Reverend J. H. Hertz, the Chief Rabbi; Lord Melchett, Lord Stamp, Mr. Beverley Nichols, Sir Hector Hetherington, Professor Harold Temperley, and many other distinguished men and women, and several high officers of various churches.

It is a tribute to the commonsense of the British people that the income of the society fell sharply from £12,075 in 1937-38 to £7,994 in 1938-39. E. S. E.

# THE MONEY-PIG

*A tale from Hans Andersen specially translated from the Danish by B. J.*

In a nursery where a number of toys lay scattered about, a money-pig stood on the top of a very high cupboard. It was made of clay in the shape of a pig, and had been bought from the potter. There was a slit in the back of the pig, and this slit had been enlarged with a knife, so that both shillings and half-crown pieces might slip through; and, indeed, there were some in the box, besides a number of pennies. The money-pig was stuffed so full that he could no longer rattle, which is the highest state of perfection to which a money-pig can attain. There he stood on the top of the cupboard, high and mighty, looking down upon everything else in the room. He knew very well that he had enough inside to buy up all the other toys, and this made him think very highly of himself. The others were also quite alive to this fact, although they did not say so, for there were other things to talk about. A large doll, still quite pretty, though rather old (her neck had been mended) lay inside a half-open drawer. She called out to the others, "Let's play at being men and women. That is such a good game."

This caused an uproar. Even the engravings in their frames on the wall turned round in their excitement and showed that they had a wrong side to them, although they had no intention of exposing themselves in this way, or of objecting to the game.

It was late at night, but as the moon shone through the window they had light at a cheap rate.

All were invited to the game, even the children's waggon, which was certainly one of the more common playthings. "Everyone has his own value," said the waggon. "We can't all be noblemen, there must be someone to do the work."

The money-pig was the only guest who received a written invitation. He occupied such an elevated position that they were afraid he would not accept an invitation by word of mouth. He replied that if he was to accept they must arrange for him to enjoy the entertainment from his own home. The little toy-theatre was therefore put up in such a way that the money-pig could look directly into it. Some wanted to

begin with a comedy, to be followed by a tea-party and a discussion for mental improvement. But proceedings started the other way about.

The rocking-horse spoke of training and races; the waggon of railways and steam-power, for these subjects bore on their respective professions. And it was right that they should talk of them. The clock talked Politics—"tick, tick"; he professed to know the time of the day, but it was rumoured that he did not go correctly. The bamboo cane stood by, looking stiff and haughty; he was very proud of his brass ferrule and silver top. On the sofa lay two embroidered cushions, pretty but stupid.

When the play began at the little theatre everyone sat and watched; they were requested to applaud and stamp or even crack when they were pleased with what they saw. But the riding-whip said he never cracked for old people, only for young people who were not yet married.

"I crack for everybody," said the cracker.

"Yes, and a fine noise you make," thought the audience as the play went on.

It was not worth much, but it was very well played, and all the characters turned their painted sides to the audience for they were made to be seen on one side only. The acting was marvellous except that they sometimes popped out beyond the foot-light (the wires being a little too long). The doll whose neck had been darned was so excited that the place in her neck burst. And the money-pig declared that he must do something for *one* of the players as they *all* had pleased him so much. So he made up his mind to remember one of them in his will, to be buried with him in his family vault, whenever that event should happen.

They all enjoyed the comedy so much that they gave up all thought of the tea-party, but they carried out their idea of intellectual amusement, which was playing at men and women. All the while each one thought most of himself, or of what the money-pig could be thinking. He was thinking of the distant (as he thought) future: his will, his burial; when it might all come

to pass.

Then all of a sudden (certainly sooner than he expected) down he crashed from the top of the cupboard and was broken to pieces. The pennies hopped and danced about in the most amusing manner. The little coins twirled round like tops, and the large ones rolled away as far as they could; especially one large round silver crown piece which had often wanted to go out into the world and was now free to do as he liked, and all the rest as well. The broken pieces of the money-pig were thrown into the dust-bin, and the next day there stood a new money-pig; but as yet with not a farthing in his inside and so he could rattle no more than the old one.

That was the beginning of *his* story, and we will make it the end of ours.

**GIVE YOUR FRIENDS**  
**The Social Crediter**  
**THIS**  
**CHRISTMAS !**

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION FORM**

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

Please send *The Social Crediter* to

Name .....

Address .....

- .....
- For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-
- ” Six ” ” 15/-
- ” Three ” ” 7/6
- ” One ” ” 2/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS**

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

**BIRMINGHAM and District Social Crediters** will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince's Cafe, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King's Room.

**BLACKBURN Social Credit Association:** Weekly meetings every Tuesday evening at 7-30 p.m. at the Friends Meeting House, King Street, Blackburn. All enquiries to 168, Shear Brow, Blackburn.

**BRADFORD United Democrats.** Enquiries to R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

**DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER** is obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

**LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association:** Meets regularly on the first and third Sundays in the month. Time 2-30 p.m. Enquiries to Secretary: Miss J. E. Taylor, 11, Nook Rise, Liverpool 15.

**LONDON LIAISON GROUP.** Enquiries to Mrs. Palmer, 35, Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent.

**NEWCASTLE and GATESHEAD Social Credit Association.** It is important that all Social Crediters on Tyneside should maintain contact. Write Hon. Secretary, R. Thomson, 108 Wordsworth Street, Gateshead.

**PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group:** Enquiries to 115, Essex Road, Milton; or 50, Ripley Grove, Copnor.

**SOUTHAMPTON Group:** Secretary C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.

**WOLVERHAMPTON:** Will all Social Crediters, old and new, keep in contact by writing E. EVANS, 15 Links Road, Penn, Wolverhampton.

**The Social Crediter**

If you are not a subscriber to *THE SOCIAL CREDITER*, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.,  
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* to me

Name .....

Address .....

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-  
" Six " " 15/-  
" Three " " 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

**EXPANSION FUND**

To the Treasurer,  
Social Credit Expansion Fund,  
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,  
12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : : ,  
as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name .....

Address .....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND.)

**Books to Read**

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy .....  
*(edition exhausted)*
- Social Credit ..... 3/6
- Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
- The Monopoly of Credit ..... 3/6
- Warning Democracy .....  
*(edition exhausted)*
- The Tragedy of Human Effort ... 6d.
- The Use of Money ..... 6d.
- Approach to Reality ..... 3d.
- Money and the Price System ... 3d.
- Nature of Democracy ..... 2d.
- Social Credit Principles ..... 1d.
- Tyranny ..... 1d.
- and
- "This 'American' Business" 3d. each  
12 for 2/-

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster ..... 4d.
- The Nature of Social Credit .... 4d.
- Debt and Taxation ..... 2d.

**ALSO**

- The Douglas Manual ..... 5/-
- The Economic Crisis:  
Southampton Chamber of  
Commerce Report ..... 6d.
- The Bankers of London  
by Percy Arnold ..... 4/6
- Economics for Everybody  
by Elles Dee ..... 3d.
- The Power of Money  
by J. B. Galway ..... 3d.
- The Purpose of Politics  
by H. E. .... 3d.
- Tax-Bonds or Bondage and the  
Answer to Federal Union  
by John Mitchell...1/- (Postage 2½.)

**Leaflets**

- Invincible Britain  
by John Mitchell ..... 2d. each,  
1/6 doz.
- What We Are About  
by H. E. .... 50 for 1/6
- Hitler and Churchill Finance  
by John Mitchell..... 50 for 1/9
- Bomb Hitler!  
by C. H. Douglas..... 100 for 1/3

All from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

H.E. and family are spending Christmas in Eskdale, Cumberland (no jazz, no bombs), and would greatly enjoy the company of other Social Crediters. For addresses of inns write to E. M. E., Fernbank, Seascale, Cumberland.

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., at 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.  
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.

Name.....

Address.....

**TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE,  
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,  
12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.**

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Advisory Chairmanship of Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month,  
per quarter,  
per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to the SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT.)